/211 cont./ There are
601 personal names which an individual receives from the theurgist,
551 but the kinship term seems to be used more in daily contact be-
[689 tween persons. It is considered an offense to mention the name
[825 of a deceased person in the presence of any of his relatives, and,
as we mentioned before, kinship terms are extended even to
speaking with certain animals during the hunt.

606 In general, dealings between persons are very free, with the exception of the strong prohibitive taboo which exists between the son-in-law and his mother-in-law and father-in-law. Usually, one must not approach one's wife's parents. Only in cases of emergency can this be done, thus breaking the custom. These cases of emergency come about, for instance, during a battle, when one of the persons is wounded.

● 597 The adoption of an orphan takes place informally when it is a matter of a small child. The family that adopts him takes him in like another one of its own members. Older children also live in a family of the group, but they are not adopted, properly speaking, for they are not given specific kinship denominations. We do not think that there are special terms to express a relationship of adoption.

554 Regarding the social structure, it seems that the main distinctions are those of sex and age. The man who carries out his daily tasks with dexterity enjoys great prestige among his peers, and those who are really successful in their work rise to the top of /212/ the social hierarchy. In Sanemá society the three theurgists which we shall mention later on enjoy high rank; but we must repeat the fact that the data regarding this matter which we present here are provisional and therefore subject to possible modification.

554 As we shall see, Sanemá society seems to have three differ-
791 ent theurgists: a "magician" /mago/, a shaman, and a priest.
756 This last one possesses characteristics of a real specialist, since,
793 for the most part, he earns his living from his office. There is not the least doubt but that the theurgists in general, and the shaman and priest in particular, represent the most influential position in Sanemá society; particularly if the two offices are carried out
000 by one and the same person. We were greatly surprised to find

11: Chagnon E-5 (1964-1968) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

that is, the marriage of individuals 1 and 2 of the third generation. Although the ten examples are given primarily to illustrate the marriage of individuals of the most recent generation (3 or 4, depending on the number of generations in each example), in some cases additional marriages in ascending generations will be discussed. The point to remember for the time being is that the genealogies should be looked at from the most recent generation; the marriage pattern can be more readily seen in this fashion.

Case A: This exemplifies the *matrilateral cross-cousin* marriage, sometimes called MoBrDa marriage. Here, the Yąnomamö category *naabïpa* corresponds exactly with our biological translation to MoBrDa. The man in question (III–1) would have called the woman *naabïpa* whether or not he married her. Similarly, she would have addressed him by the term for husband: *ãpuwa*.

The marriage of III–1 to III–2 in this case also exemplifies *patrilateral cross-cousin* marriage, for the woman is related to her husband as FaSiDa as well. This is so because individuals II–1 and II–4 are siblings (brother and sister to each other) because their own fathers, in turn, were brothers. (Individual I–2 was an *adopted* brother to I–5, hence the broken sibling line connecting them.) When an individual marries a woman who is simultaneously his FaSiDa and MoBrDa, he is said to marry his *bilateral cross-cousin*. Case A illustrates the preferred form of marriage, for the man does not have to avoid his wife's parents as stringently as he would were they related to him in a different fashion. When a man's father-in-law is his MoBr, he is on extremely intimate terms with him and can even make jokes at his expense. The intimacy of the relationship between a man and his MoBr was brought home to me very indelibly on one occasion. A group of Patanowä-teri men visited Kąobawä, although their two villages were at war. One of the visitors was Kąobawä's wife's brother. After this man rested in a hammock for a few minutes, he got up and found Ariwari, Kąobawä's son. Ariwari was the visitor's sister's son. He played with him in the hammock and hugged him intimately (see Fig. 3–3). Ariwari fell asleep in his arms. This took place in spite of the fact that the visitors were in danger of being killed by other members of Kąobawä's group and narrowly escaped death on their previous visit. (See the section "Division of Labor and Daily Social Life" later in this chapter for a description of the incident.)

Case B: This illustrates the same kind of marriage that took place in Case A, except that the parents of the married people are half-siblings to each other. The Yąnomamö do not distinguish half-siblings from full siblings, so this situation is identical, as far as they are concerned, to the marriage in case A.

Case B also illustrates *sororal polygyny*: III–1 married two women who were related to each other as sisters.

Finally, it should be noted that the father of the man in question married a sister to individual II–3. They stood in wife-giver/wife-receiver relationship to each other and so do their children.

Case C: This illustrates the *patrilateral cross-cousin* marriage, that is, the FaSiDa marriage. Like the MoBrDa marriage, it is preferred because the man does not have to avoid his wife's parents. It is considered to be incestuous for a man to be familiar with his wife's mother if the woman is still sexually active. Hence, he must avoid her. If she is his FaSi, however, incest prohibitions pertaining to that kinswoman would automatically call forth appropriate behavior on his part, and the avoidance taboo is not stringent.

11: Chagnon E-5 (1964-1968) 1968 SQ18 Yanoama SQ18

606 123 [551] The avoidance taboo prohibits a man from saying his mother-in-law's name. My informants would be extremely embarrassed when I would say the name of their mother-in-law while collecting genealogies. Kaobawä, for example, would grin sheepishly and hide his head. Men must also avoid their mothers-in-law physically and should not look at them. If I took a group of people for a ride in my canoe, there would always be considerable shuffling of bodies so that the men could be situated in the canoe as far away from their mothers-in-law as possible.

128 602 595 Finally, case C illustrates another kind of sororal polygyny: Individuals III-1 and III-3 are sisters to each other because their mothers are sisters. (The equation stating that children of siblings of the same sex are themselves siblings extends indefinitely in the case of males, but breaks down in the case of females after two generations. This is because descent is patrilineal.)

128 582 602 *Case D:* This also is a case of FaSiDa marriage: I-2 and I-3 were brothers, so one of the parents of each of the third generation individuals were brother and sister to each other. Hence, III-1 married his FaSiDa.

128 595 602 *Case E:* The marriage of III-1 to III-2 is similar to the marriage in case D, but his marriage to the second wife, III-3, illustrates the use of another kinship equation. She is an actual sister to the first wife, but does not stand in the FaSiDa relationship to her husband. If one of the sisters is FaSiDa, however, then all of them are in Yąnomamö kinship usage.

128 582 602 [601] *Case F:* This illustrates how affinal ties replace consanguineal ties should the two conflict. III-1 can trace a blood tie to his wife, one that would prevent him from marrying her, but the affinal ties between his own father and the father of his wife permit him to marry according to the prescription. Individual III-1 would call all of his father's wives "mother." Hence, his own wife is, technically, MoBrDa.

128 582 587 602 *Case G:* This illustrates a number of marriage rules stated in the preceding examples. I present it as a sort of exercise to reinforce the logic of the Yąnomamö kinship equations given above. Individual II-6 married two brothers, II-5 and II-7, illustrating the *levirate*: the marriage between a man and his brother's widow. Individual II-9 married his FaSiDa (as in case F). Individuals III-3 and III-4 can marry because their fathers were cross-cousins (see case H, below). Individual III-5 married his FaSiDa, as was shown for the similar marriage in case E. Individual IV-1 married two women, each of whom is his FaSiDa. This is so because I-2 and I-4 were adopted brothers, so that their [597] sons (II-2 and II-4) were also siblings. Hence, IV-1 married his FaSiDa (IV-2) and, as in case E, her sister. His second wife is also FaSiDa because her mother (III-6) was a sister to III-2, since their respective fathers (II-9 and II-2) were (adopted) brothers.

128 582 601 602 *Case H:* This illustrates a very powerful marriage rule: The children of men who call each other *shoriwä* (brother-in-law) can marry. Practically speaking, in our kinship terms, the rule is that the children of cross-cousins stand in marriage-able relationship to each other. II-2 and II-3 stand in wife-giver/wife-receiver relationship to each other and could exchange sisters in marriage. Their sons stand in the same relationship. Another important feature of Yąnomamö kinship and marriage rules is illustrated here. While III-1 married a woman of the prescribed category, he does not reckon his relationship to her patrilaterally or matrilaterally. That is, she is neither FaSiDa nor MoBrDa, but she is both! This emphasizes the fact that they marry primarily in terms of categories rather than by tracing biological ties, as I have done in the above examples. To the Yąnomamö,